

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

MICHAEL E SAMPSON,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Civil Action No. 22-381
v.)	Judge Cathy Bissoon
)	
MARK SOKOL,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

ORDER

Plaintiff's Complaint will be dismissed, without prejudice to the filing of an amended complaint, pursuant to the screening provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

Plaintiff has been granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, and the Complaint is subject to the screening provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915. See Atamian v. Burns, 236 F. App'x 753, 755 (3d Cir. 2007) ("[T]he provisions of § 1915(e) apply to all *in forma pauperis* complaints, not simply those filed by prisoners."). Among other things, the statute requires the Court to dismiss any action where the plaintiff "fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii).

Any leniency generally afforded *pro se* litigants notwithstanding, the Complaint neither articulates the grounds for the Court's jurisdiction, nor provides a short and plain statement showing that Plaintiff is entitled to relief. Plaintiff alleges that his company lost some funding opportunities upon issuance of certain patents.¹ There is no apparent basis for exercising federal question jurisdiction on the facts alleged. The Complaint also runs afoul of Federal Rule 8

¹ To the extent that Plaintiff is pursuing claims on behalf of his company, the Court notes that "[a]lthough an individual may represent herself or himself *pro se*, a non-attorney may not represent other parties in federal court." Murray on behalf of Purnell v. City of Philadelphia, 901 F.3d 169, 170 (3d Cir. 2018).

because Plaintiff has not pleaded any facts that support his claim(s). *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a) (requiring “short and plain statement[s]” showing that the pleader is entitled to relief) *and* 8(d)(1) (“Each allegation must be simple, concise, and direct.”).

Accordingly, Plaintiff’s Complaint (**Doc. 4**) is **DISMISSED** pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915 and Fed. R. Civ. P. 8. The dismissal is without prejudice to Plaintiff filing an amended complaint, by no later **May 25, 2022**, that identifies a valid jurisdictional basis for proceeding, complies with Federal Rule 8 and otherwise states claim(s) upon which relief properly may be granted. Should Plaintiff not timely file such an amended complaint, the Court summarily will enter an order converting the dismissal to one with prejudice. Finally, Plaintiff must make last, best efforts in these regards, because further opportunity for amendment will not be afforded.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

April 27, 2022

s/Cathy Bissoon
Cathy Bissoon
United States District Judge

cc (via First-Class U.S. Mail):

MICHAEL E SAMPSON
INDEPENDENT ENERGY SYSTEMS
205 EAST HIGHLAND AVE.
LONGVIEW, TX 75602